

# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY POLICY AND STRATEGY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 18, 2001  
State Library, Room 218 & 219

## Present

Al Sherwood  
Alan Carlsen  
Jeanne Watanabe  
Brent Cleverly  
Connie Laws  
Douglas Richins  
Jerome Battle  
Ken Elliott  
Kevin VanAusdal  
Brent Sanderson  
Lloyd Johnson

Gary Wixom  
Neal Christensen  
Randy Fisher  
Roland Squire  
Steve Hess  
Bob Woolley  
Harry Sutton  
Brad Brown  
Gary Wixom  
Cyndi Rowland  
Marty Blair  
Paul Bohman

## I. WELCOME AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Tab 9)

Al Sherwood called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

**The October minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting; time is needed to review them.**

## II. CHANGES TO RULE 365-3 (Tab 10)

Jeanne Watanabe reviewed the rule to address the change and wording of the rule. It was suggested that the CIO's office do rewrite of the rule capturing the changes from the meeting that need to be made. For example when does the CIO office want to know about the transfer of software? To be able to define the global perspective the CIO office should know how the software is being shared in and across state lines. Some felt the CIO needed to approve these transfers to create an internal control. Others felt that agency management should provide this. Doug Richins suggested that maybe the CIO's office could be informed prior to the transfer and that the CIO could communicate this information to the ITPSC. The issue to be resolved is: Should the CIO approve or be informed of the change.

**Motion: Harry Sutton made the motion to table the discussion and reword the rule based upon input from today's meeting. Roland Squire seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.**

## III. ARCHITECTURE AND STANDARDS (Tab 11 & 12)

### SISC Annual Report

Bob Woolley updated the council on the activities of SISC over the last year. Bob indicated that the policies proposed for review and approval are needed. It is hard to implement a security policy if we don't have one. These documents are the best current cut of a family of policies. There has been broad input from many state agencies on SISC. Firewall solutions are like an onion, there are several parts, and it is very detailed and complicated to tease one layer away from the rest.

Brad Brown asked which documents are in draft form and which are final"? Bob Woolley stated the documents for approval are Enterprise Intrusion, VPN, the Security Charter and Security Policy and they

are in final form. The remainder of the documents represents drafts. The Web Standards will be handled separately.

### **Enterprise Intrusion Detection 2000**

This standard is applicable to all executive government agencies in the state of Utah.

**Motion: Roland Squire made the motion to approve Enterprise Intrusion Detection 2000. Harry Sutton seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.**

### **VPN Standard**

It is stated in the policy “to withdraw state information security policy”, suggested to delete that sentence.

**Motion: Harry Sutton made the motion to delete the state information security sentence and approve the policy with that deletion. Randy Fisher seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.**

### **State Information Security Charter**

The time line was discussed in regards to submitting the charter and policy to the Governor. Discussion of presenting it to the Governor before it is completed then ITPSC will possibly lose control, Al Sherwood emphasized that would not happen

**Motion to approve the Charter. Lloyd Johnson seconded the motion.**

Discussion followed about the timing of the charter and the concern that agency executive leadership would need time to review it in advance prior to any presentation to Cabinet Council. Some ITPSC members expressed that they would like to have their executives review it prior to the Governor signing it.

**The motion was amended to support follow-up with the Governor but asked the CIO to allow time for executive agency leadership to review it prior to the Governor signing it. The motion was approved with all in favor.**

### **State Information Security Policy**

Bob Woolley reviewed the proposed SISP and indicated it has been recommended to the ITPSC in its present form by the SISC. The policy intent is to make a readable policy the employee can sign off on. The network access should be reworded to downsize the policy. Some committee members expressed concern about the length of the document. Some expressed that anything more than one page will not be read. Brent Cleverly asked what consequence would there be if an employee did not sign it? Another member stated that he thought that seventy-five percent of employees would not understand the document as it stands. Signature of the document was discussed. Harry Sutton said the employee already signs the acceptable use policy. Also discussed was leaving the signing up to discretion of the agencies. Discussion continued on the “should’s” and “must’s” in the security policy. It is a nice description of a perfect world Kevin VanAusdal stated. He said we are implying we can enforce the musts. It was indicated that it would be the responsibility of agency management to ensure that the policy was enforced and to take appropriate actions if and when the policy was violated. Al asked the question to the group about whether or not they saw themselves as having the authority to set statewide policy including the ability to mandate statewide policy that agencies would be obligated to follow. Members responded that they understood that the committee had that authority. Al indicated that he believed from his reading of the statute that this was correct. Policy is a statement of direction, and the agency should carry it out.

Opinions were expressed of the need to shorten the size of the document and divide it into separate sections. One section would apply to agency managers and the other to the employee. Al Sherwood also suggested that the “shoulds” and “musts” be separated into separate subsections. One section could be called guidelines or best practices and would contain only recommendations. The other section would

contain statements that the statewide security infrastructure simply cannot do without. These would be stated as requirements to be enforced by agency management.

**Motion: Brad Brown made the motion to reduce document size and bring to next meeting for further discussion and action. Harry Sutton seconded the motion. A substitute motion was made by Kevin VanAusdal to change all musts to should. Brad Brown seconded the motion. The substitute motion failed. The original motion was voted on with all in favor less one opposed.**

#### **Web Standards Revision**

Marty Blair introduced himself, Dr. Cyndi Rowland and Paul Bohman from the Utah State University. Marty directs the 508 guidelines. His group provided consultation on 508. Dr Cyndi Rowland directs telecommunications. Paul Bohman is a web master. He stated that most of any costs are upfront costs for training and becoming accustomed to making and keep web pages accessible. Paul indicated that it “takes more time to learn what has to be done then to do it.” The question was raised of changes being retroactive. Paul stated the redesigning of sites usually happens in 18-month cycles so the changes will be incorporated. Although 508 does not mandate state participation it is covered anyway under 504, better known as the Americans with Disabilities Act. ADA will drive this and agencies need to be ready to make their web sites ADA accessible.

**Motion: Roland Squire made the motion to approve the web standards with a review by the Attorney General’s Office of the web accessibility portion of the document. Lloyd Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed.**

#### **IV. META TAG GENERATION SOFTWARE (Tab 14)**

Craig stated there is one form or another of Meta tag standards in seventeen states; all are more complex then what we are looking for here. The State library will assist and/or provide metatagging services for agencies. They are prepared to offer training and full Meta tagging for agency web pages. Meta tagging will be phased in over a period of time. A collection of web pages will be available to be accessed by different search engines. State library will provide any level of assistance needed. Software to assist in automating the process is available. The meeting time and short and Al deferred the demonstration until a subsequent meeting. The addition of Meta tags to the web standards policy will be proposed for review by the web standards committee.

#### **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:40 A.M.**